

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF LOUISIANA
SHREVEPORT DIVISION

MARK OWEN TEAKELL

CIVIL ACTION NO. 07-1123-P

VERSUS

JUDGE HICKS

STATE OF LOUISIANA

MAGISTRATE JUDGE HORNSBY

REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION

In accordance with the standing order of this Court, this matter was referred to the undersigned Magistrate Judge for review, report and recommendation.

STATEMENT OF CLAIM

Before the Court is a petition for writ of habeas corpus filed by pro se petitioner Mark Owen Teakell, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2254. This petition was received and filed in this Court on July 2, 2007. Petitioner names the State of Louisiana as respondent.

Petitioner was ordered on December 6, 2007, to file, within 30 days of the service of the order, documentary proof that he has exhausted his available state court remedies. [Doc. 20]. To date, Petitioner has not complied with the order.

Accordingly;

IT IS RECOMMENDED that this petition be **DISMISSED WITHOUT PREJUDICE**, sua sponte, for failure to prosecute, pursuant to Rule 41(b) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure as interpreted by the Court and under the Court's inherent power to control its own docket. See Link v. Wabash Railroad Company, 370 U.S. 626, 82

S.Ct. 1386 (1962); Rogers v. Kroger Company, 669 F.2d 317, 320-321 (5th Cir. 1983).

OBJECTIONS

Under the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C) and Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b), parties aggrieved by this recommendation have ten (10) business days from service of this Report and Recommendation to file specific, written objections with the Clerk of Court unless an extension of time is granted under Fed. R. Civ. P. 6(b). A party may respond to another party's objections within ten (10) days after being served with a copy thereof. Counsel are directed to furnish a courtesy copy of any objections or responses to the District Judge at the time of filing.

A party's failure to file written objections to the proposed findings, conclusions and recommendation set forth above, within ten (10) days after being served with a copy shall bar that party, except upon grounds of plain error, from attacking on appeal the proposed factual findings and legal conclusions that were accepted by the district court and that were not objected to by the aforementioned party. See Douglas v. U.S.A.A., 79 F.3d 1415 (5th Cir. 1996) (en banc).

THUS DONE AND SIGNED, in chambers, at Shreveport, Louisiana, on this 3rd day of March, 2008.



MARK L. HORNSBY
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE